required to be made when the hanging goal are exceeded 4000 sq. m. were not completed in quick time.

5. Reduction of rib also appeared to be more than what could be considered judicious for the situation.

6. From the deposition before the Court and during the statutory inquiry by DGMS and also available records, it is apparent that there were indications of weighting in the working areas prior to the accident. Under the given geo-mining condition, weighting followed by the floor heaving could be expected before the local falls and the main falls indicating redistribution of the stresses. Apparently. the management failed to read the indications correctly.

7. Extraction in panel No 46B had been started while extraction in panel 46A on the south side was still in progress. This accident occurred only about 16/17 days after adjoining panel was sealed off. So it can be safely concluded that movement in panel No. 46A had not completely stopped at the time of accident. Load transfer due to interaction of the stresses from the adjoining goal probably led to the sudden dynamic loading for which the workers failed to get any early indication.

8. In 2nd shift of 16-10-2003, 1st dip slice of 55-1/2 LS/9 Dip got connected to the goal on the dip side and the rib on the south side was reduced by blasting. At about 1.00 A.M on 17-10-2003 (3rd shift of 16-10-2003). while loading of coal from the blasted rib was being done in the presence of some coal-cutters, support personnel and the sirdar, a local fall occurred in the goal which extended into the workings crushing the south side rib and ten persons were buried underneath it while two escaped with minor injuries.

(3) Central Saunda mine accident of Central Coalfields Limited on 15-06-2005:

The accident was caused due to connection between working district of Bansgarha seam and overlying water-logged abandoned workings of Hathidari seam caused by fall of roof. The accident occurred due to failure as keeping Hatidari seam (lying above and within 60m of working district of Bansgarha seam) free of water as required by condition number 5.3 of permission letter no. RR/10297/Perm-100(I)/03/2930 dated 20.11.03 granted under regulation 100 (I) of Coal Mine Regulation 1957. The scam was extracted beyond permitted area in panel no. II forming an exposure of fault plane constituted to the fall of roof and subsequently inundation.

(4) In case **of Bhatdih (Nagda) Colliery of BCCL, the Court of Enquiry instituted is yet to submit its report.**

Review of royalty on coal

†1216. SHRI DATTA MEGHE: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether some coal producing States have sought to increase royalty of States on coal;

(b) if so, the decision taken by Government in this regard;

---

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

(c) whether the royalty given to the States on coal is reviewed after every three years under the Mines and Mineral Development Regulatory Act; and

(d) if so, how many times such review has been made so far and the results thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COAL (DR. DASARI NARAYAN RAO): (a) and (b) Yes, Sir. Rates of royalty of coal has been revised vide Notification No.GS.R.522 (E) dated 01.08.2007.

(c) and (d) Section 9(3) of the Mines and Minerals (Regulation & Development) Act, 1957 empowers the Central Government to enhance or reduce the royalty rates in respect of coal and lignite. The proviso to the aforesaid Section prevents the Central Government from enhancing the rate of royalty on coal and lignite more than once during any period of three years. It is not mandatory to revise the rate of royalty on coal and lignite after every three years. However, the rates of royalty are revised after taking into consideration the interests of all stake holders and the overall economic scenario of the Country.

Review on royalty rates had been made six times since 1971 and as a result thereof the royalty rates on coal were fixed/revised on 19.02.1971, 17.07.75, 13.02.1981, 11.10.1994, 16.08.2002 and 01.08.2007.

Target fixed for various units of CIL

†1217. SHRI AJAY MAROO: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) the production target fixed for various subsidiary units of Coal India Ltd. during the first quarter of current financial year;

(b) the production done by these subsidiary units against the target;

(c) if the production is below the target, the reasons therefore; and

(d) the steps being taken to improve the production?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COAL (DR. DASARI NARAYAN RAO): (a) and (b) Subsidiary-wise coal production (Provisional) of Coal India Ltd. during first quarter of the current financial year (2007-08) is as under:

(In million tonnes)

Company	Target	Actual	Shortfall
1	2	3	4
Eastern Coalfields Ltd.	7.466	5.621	-1.845
Bharat Coking Coal Ltd.	5.765	5.510	-0255
Central Coalfields Ltd.	8.805	7.436	-1369
Northern Coalfields Ltd.	12.785	12.798	40.013

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi